

## **General Disclaimer**

### **One or more of the Following Statements may affect this Document**

- This document has been reproduced from the best copy furnished by the organizational source. It is being released in the interest of making available as much information as possible.
- This document may contain data, which exceeds the sheet parameters. It was furnished in this condition by the organizational source and is the best copy available.
- This document may contain tone-on-tone or color graphs, charts and/or pictures, which have been reproduced in black and white.
- This document is paginated as submitted by the original source.
- Portions of this document are not fully legible due to the historical nature of some of the material. However, it is the best reproduction available from the original submission.

NASA CONTRACTOR REPORT 166495

Emergency Medical Service (EMS)-  
Rotorcraft Technology Workshop



(NASA-CR-166495) EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICE  
(EMS): ROTORCRAFT TECHNOLOGY WORKSHOP  
(Operations Research, Inc.) 39 p  
HC A03/MF A01

N83-30325

CSCL 05A

63/85 12835  
Unclas

James Bauchspies  
Richard Adams

CONTRACT NAS2-10411  
October 1981

**NASA**

NASA CONTRACTOR REPORT 166495

ORIGINAL FILED IN  
OF POOR QUALITY

Emergency Medical Service (EMS) -  
Rotorcraft Technology Workshop

James Bauchspies  
ORI, Inc.  
1400 Spring St.  
Silver Spring, MD 20910

&

Richard Adams  
Systems Control Technology  
2326 S. Congress Ave., Suite 2A  
West Palm Beach, FL 33406

Prepared for  
Ames Research Center  
under Contract NAS2-10411



National Aeronautics and  
Space Administration

Ames Research Center  
Moffett Field, California 94035

#### **SPONSORED BY**

National Aeronautics and Space Administration  
Ames Research Center

#### **Workshop Planning and Management**

Judi Beaver, ORI, Inc.  
Lori Thompson, ORI, Inc.  
Deborah Menne, ORI, Inc.  
Gabriel Berry, ORI, Inc.

#### **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

John Zuk, NASA Ames  
James Bauchspies, ORI, Inc.  
Richard Adams, SCT

#### **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

John Zuk, NASA Ames, Chairman  
Ronald Ace, SCT  
Richard Adams, SCT  
James Bauchspies, ORI, Inc.  
Betty Berkstresser, NASA Ames  
Robert Borland, Bell Helicopter Textron  
Howard Champion, M.D., Washington Hospital Center  
Earl (Butch) Cronin, U.S. Park Police  
Terry Jagerson, San Bernardino County Sheriff's Office  
Robert Morrison, Huntington Beach Police Department  
John Ward, NASA Headquarters

#### **Washington Hospital Center**

MedSTAR- Tour and Demonstration  
Dr. Howard Champion, M.D.  
Dr. Mark Buchley, M.D.  
MedSTAR Staff

#### **AIRCRAFT DISPLAYS**

Bell Helicopter Textron "Longranger"  
Bell Helicopter Textron "Jetranter"  
Augusta 109A

For further information about the Workshop contact John Zuk,  
Branch Chief, Aeronautical Systems Branch, Mail Stop 237-11,  
NASA Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, CA 94035.

The contents of this document represent the consensus of participants in the Emergency Medical Service (EMS) -Rotorcraft Technology Workshop. Each specific recommendation is not necessarily accepted by each participant. The contents also do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of any public or private organizations which participated in the Workshop.

# Emergency Medical Service (EMS)-Rotorcraft Technology Workshop

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### BACKGROUND

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) sponsored a Public Service Helicopter User's Workshop at its Ames Research Center in July 1980. This Workshop examined the use and benefits of public service helicopters in Law Enforcement and Public Safety, Disaster Relief, Emergency Medical Services (EMS), Search and Rescue, and Fire Protection. The consensus of the Workshop's Working Group Chairmen was that continuing NASA/operator interchanges were critical to the establishment of research and technology programs responsive to Public Service Operator needs. The Emergency Medical Service (EMS) - Rotorcraft Technology Workshop was the first response to this call for NASA/operator interchange. The purpose of the workshop was to provide both an extensive and intensive overview of the increasing role of rotorcraft in EMS together with panel discussions of rotorcraft technology needs from the standpoint of manufacturers and users as well as national benefits and opportunities.

### The Helicopter Role in EMS

Trauma kills 115,000 persons a year at an annual cost to society of \$87 billion. Improved emergency medical services (EMS) can reduce this high mortality rate that results from injuries caused by traffic, occupational, residential, and recreational accidents. Prompt on scene treatment by medical personnel using modern emergency medical equipment and rapid transport of the victim from the injury scene to a shock trauma center can reduce the number of mortalities by 50%. Another form of EMS where time


is vital is hospital to hospital transfer of critical patients requiring specialized treatment, and transport of organs/blood, medical supplies and equipment.

There is a growing support for regional state shock trauma centers based on helicopter transportation to and from the injury scene. It has been demonstrated by existing shock trauma centers that helicopters can reduce response time by as much as 80%. In recognition of the importance of helicopters to EMS, helicopters at hospitals have doubled over the last five years.

Helicopters also perform other EMS related public services such as Search and Rescue (SAR) and Disaster Relief. U.S. helicopters have airlifted approximately 800,000 persons from life threatening situations such as ship collisions, floods, fires and aircraft accidents in remote areas. In 1978 the U.S. Coast Guard flew 11,700 helicopter SAR missions, saving 1,953 lives.

## OBJECTIVES OF WORKSHOP

- To provide an extensive and intensive overview of the increasing role of rotorcraft in EMS.
- To reach a consensus of present and future rotorcraft technology needs from the standpoint of manufacturers and users as well as national benefits and opportunities.
- To provide EMS planners an insight into the various concepts currently in operation as well as an opportunity to discuss current and proposed EMS equipment.
- To provide technologists (manufacturers, operators and researchers) an insight into rotorcraft technology needs as seen by EMS users.



ORIGINAL PAGE IS  
OF POOR QUALITY

## MAJOR FINDINGS

- A lead organization on the National level should be designated to establish concepts, locations and number of shock-trauma air medical services.
- The organizations listed below should be informed concerning the potential benefits of a National EMS program.
  - FEDERAL/STATE**
  - Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)
  - Office of Emergency Services (OES)
  - Military Services
  - Office of Civil Defense
  - Department of Transportation/National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (DOT/NHTSA)
  - Department of Health and Human Services (DH&HS)
  - National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA)
  - PRIVATE SECTOR**
  - Insurance Industry
  - American Medical Association (AMA)
  - Medical Life Support and Diagnostic Equipment Manufacturers
  - Helicopter Manufacturers
- NASA should assume the lead role in integrating Technology Requirements to define the potential market for Advanced Public Service Helicopters in the following areas:
  - EMS
  - Law Enforcement
  - Disaster Relief
  - Fire Fighting
  - Military
- Great opportunities exist for current vehicles, but medical specialists desire an advanced vehicle, particularly one which incorporates advances in medical technology trends in health care.
- Key technology needs for the EMS helicopter of the future are:
  - Ride quality of fixed wing aircraft, i.e., reduced internal and external noise, reduced vibration
  - No tail rotor
  - Small rotor diameter
  - Improved visibility
  - Crashworthy vehicle
  - IFR capability
  - More affordable
  - High reliability
  - Fuel efficient
  - Specialized cabins for advanced medical/diagnostic and communications equipment
- The outcome of the trauma patient (mortality/morbidity and costs) is improved by reducing time between accident/incident and definitive medical care.
  - Cost to society is estimated by the U.S. Department of Transportation to be 87 billion dollars per year
  - DOT forecasts an increase in deaths/injury severity due to the large/small car mix on highways
  - Vehicle must enable patient to have rapid access to technology and surgical skills
  - Total system speed is essential
- Spectrum of on-site approaches:
  - Stabilization through intensive care unit
  - Number and type of hospitals is a function of geography, population density, medical care philosophy, use rate, etc.

## OVERVIEW OF WORKSHOP

The EMS-Rotorcraft Technology Workshop was sponsored by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Ames Research Center. The Workshop was held on 14 and 15 October, 1981, in the Health and Human Services Auditorium, Washington, D.C.

The Workshop brought together representatives from all aspects of Emergency Medical Services, including public officials at all levels of government, EMS physicians, rotorcraft users, manufacturers and researchers.

The Workshop was interspersed with technology review sessions, overview sessions and panel discussions. Topics covered in these sessions and panel discussions ranged from accomplishments and future technology needs for EMS aircraft and medical requirements for future helicopters to costs/benefits of helicopter EMS.

The detailed workshop agenda is presented in Appendix A.

The list of workshop attendees is presented in Appendix B.



ORIGINAL PAGE IS  
OF POOR QUALITY



ORIGINAL PAGE IS  
OF POOR QUALITY

## ABSTRACTS OF SELECTED WORKSHOP PRESENTATIONS

The Workshop was privileged to have among its speakers internationally recognized leaders in the field of the use of helicopters in EMS. An insight into two approaches to the National EMS system was provided by Dr. Christian Buhler, Chief Executive Officer of Swiss Air Rescue (SAR), and Dr. Gerhard Kugler of the German Automobile Club (ADAC). Dr. R Adams Cowley, Director of the Maryland Institute of Emergency Medical Services System (MIEMSS) and featured in the book and television drama, "Shock Trauma", presented an overview of the MIEMSS. Dr. Howard Champion, Director, Shock-Trauma Unit, Washington Hospital Center, provided an insight into a functioning EMS program. Brief biographical sketches of these individuals and abstracts of their presentations follow.

### Dr. Christian Buhler

The keynote remarks were presented by Dr. Christian Buhler, Chief Executive Officer of Swiss Air-Rescue (SAR) and its subsidiary, Swiss Air-Ambulance Ltd. Prior to assuming his present position, Dr. Buhler had been a freelance pilot with SAR and beginning in 1971 became SAR's chief pilot and in charge of various other functions.

This world renowned authority on the use of helicopters in EMS set the tone for the workshop by his presentation which is abstracted below:

#### *"Today's Accomplishments and Tomorrow's Requirements for EMS Aircraft"*

The Swiss Air Rescue (SAR) was formed in 1952 as a part of the Swiss Lifesaving Association, but was reorganized in 1960 as a separate organization. Since its inception, SAR has pioneered many rescue techniques involving aircraft, both fixed and rotary wing, and has conducted some spectacular rescue and life-



Dr. Christian Buhler

saving missions. In 1960, the SAR concluded that professional medical aid must be taken to the accident site, the patient must be transported expeditiously to a hospital for proper treatment. In 1980, SAR conducted 6,000 operational flights. The SAR has 15 operational bases, serving any place in Switzerland within 15 flying minutes from a SAR base. To put this in perspective, Switzerland is one-sixth the size of Colorado but has twice the population. It has 250 plus hospitals compared to 50 in Colorado.

SAR employs helicopters that have IFR capability. In 1981, 300 night flights were conducted. High powered search lights are mounted on the helicopters to aid in rescue missions at night. The SAR Mission is wide ranging and includes operations involving: mountain rescue; rescue with winch; avalanche conditions; glacier crevasse rescue; cable car evacuation; hospital-to-hospital transfer; aid to farmers in remote areas; firefighting utilizing

water buckets; catastrophic situations; out of country aid such as earthquake relief; and repatriation of ill and injured Swiss citizens from foreign countries.

SAR operations are organized and coordinated by one central base. This central base knows the degree of readiness of each satellite base. SAR has a dedicated one-way radio network (32 stations) used by SAR control to designate the "how, when, and with which means" for each incident, i.e., SAR control transmits the medical indication, degree of emergency, technical conditions, weather and topographical information.

SAR is an independent, humanitarian and charitable organization, with most of its support coming from donations, voluntary contributions and legacies. Two-thirds of SAR's 20 million Swiss franc operating cost is donated. Financial support from the Swiss Government is less than 5 percent.

SAR is examining future requirements of its air rescue/ambulance system. Aircraft will be used solely for air rescue and ambulance services. Multipurpose use is being phased out. The helicopter cabin requirement must be able to carry two seated attendants and one or two patients on the same level. The helicopter should be twin engine for over water/town operations. Its characteristics should include, *inter alia*: maximum take-off weight - 8,000 pounds; hovering altitude 7,000-11,000 feet; reduced diameter of rotor blades; fast engine start up and no warm up time; lower external and internal noise; IFR; rescue winch (550 pounds/200' cable length).


There is a need to standardize air ambulance space and openings. SAR requires a 72" x 18" standard stretcher to be loaded into a helicopter without tilting the stretcher and with means of safely attaching the stretcher inside.

The interior cabin should be equipped the same as a road ambulance interior, with a minimum door opening of 1 meter by 1

meter. Some other features include: access to patient's head, neck and thorax; low cabin noise level; efficient cabin heating; oxygen storage of 10 liters per minute of flight time; ready access to medical appliance and supplies; suitable lighting of patient's upper body; 2-way helicopter-hospital radio. Medical equipment and supplies should include: incubator; monitor; suction pump; respirator; infusion pump; fibrolator; drugs.

Acquisition of this future system calls for heavy financial expense. When the question is asked: "Is there a justification for a costly air ambulance/rescue service", the response is usually negative — until the time comes for those individuals to make use of it.

ORIGINAL PAGE IS  
OF POOR QUALITY



ORIGINAL PAGE IS  
OF POOR QUALITY

### Dr. Gerhard Kugler


Another well known international authority in the field of helicopters and EMS is Dr. Gerhard Kugler.

Dr. Kugler is Director of the Emergency Rescue Department, German Automobile Club (ADAC) and editor of the ADAC-Rescue Helicopter News in Germany. Following is an abstract of his presentation.

#### *The Air Rescue System in the Federal Republic of Germany - West German Statistics of 10 Years of Operation, Helicopter Tasks and Technical Helicopter Requirements"*

Improving the system of medical aid is not merely a question of quantity, but more so of the quality of the means of rescue. A decisive factor in the success of the treatment is ensuring optimum care of the emergency patient at the scene of the incident shortly after the injury has occurred. This has been the goal towards which the development of a dense air rescue service network has been directed since 1970 in the Federal Republic of Germany, for which ADAC laid the cornerstone with the first pilot tests. Standards for the organization of the air rescue service and the equipment of the rescue helicopter were established. According to these standards, not all helicopters are suitable for use in the rescue service. The most important criteria for deciding whether or not they qualify for use are, for example, turbine engines, because of their low vibration level, and sufficient room for treatment in the cabin with stretchers placed side by side.

At present, there are 30 air rescue centers in the Federal Republic of Germany at which helicopters are stationed daily from 6:00 A.M. until sunset exclusively for rescue purposes. The helicopters are always stationed at large hospitals which supply doctors for all rescue flights. The helicopters can take off in a maximum of two minutes after the accident report has been received, and they fly within a radius of 50 - 70 km. They are directed by the central rescue control centers.



Dr. Gerhard Kugler

Since 1970, the rescue helicopters have flown 106,000 missions. All data relating to the missions were evaluated by ADAC by electronic data processing. By sharing the costs, expenses have been kept at a minimum. The Federal Ministry of the Interior bears investment costs, while ADAC pays administrative costs. Running costs are refunded by the health insurance institutions. ADAC has signed contracts to this effect with the health insurance institutions.

### Dr. R Adams Cowley


In the United States much of the credit for the development of EMS systems must go to Dr. R Adams Cowley, M.D., Director of the Maryland Institute for Emergency Medical Services System (MIEMSS). He is nationally and internationally recognized as the founder of the shock-trauma program concept and a leader in EMS systems development. The abstract of Dr. Cowley's presentation follows:

#### *"MIEMSS - Organization, Accomplishments and Future Technology Needs"*


The Maryland Institute for Emergency Medical Services Systems exists as a total and completely integrated statewide system with all phases and components interlinked to form a continuum of care for the critically ill or injured victim. This includes a statewide communications system, transportation, trauma center and rehabilitation centers.

The survival rate of patients admitted presently approaches 84%. Area-wide regional trauma centers and specialty referral centers for definitive care are integrated into a network of EMS communications and "Med-Evac Helicopters" are operated by the Maryland State police for multi-purpose missions, with medical missions having absolute priority. The use of helicopters for quick transport of trauma victims, together with the rapid restoration of circulating blood volume, tissue perfusion, oxygenation and prompt surgery will decrease mortality by approximately 50%.

The vast experience of MEIMSS affords the opportunity to offer ideas on the future design and implementation of helicopters with the medical community. Some of Dr. Cowley's concepts are presented under "Medical aspects of EMS".



Dr. R Adams Cowley



ORIGINAL PAGE IS  
OF POOR QUALITY

### Dr. Howard Champion

A further insight into a functioning EMS program was provided by Dr. Howard Champion, M.D., Director, Shock-Trauma Program, Washington Hospital Center. From 1972-1976, Dr. Champion assisted in the clinical program at Maryland's Shock-Trauma Unit in Baltimore. Dr. Champion has been associated with the use of helicopters in EMS for over 10 years. The abstract of his paper follows:

#### *"Technical and Medical Requirements of Future Helicopters"*

The problem with trauma is that the death rate is increasing and it is the most expensive disease in modern society. The prospects for increases in trauma situations mandates technology developments in the medical and helicopter emergency medical services field.

Presently there are no good studies documenting the impact of trauma centers and helicopters on trauma victim outcome. There is no system or data to normalize the case mix in patient population. Twenty percent of trauma victims die at the accident scene; 77% of those who die in the hospital do so in the first 24 hours, with the highest percentage dying within the first 3 hours. The value of the helicopter in reducing mortality has been documented, but the selection of trauma victims needed to be transported by helicopter based on injury severity must be improved. A common language is being developed to provide medical personnel with a description of injury severity.

In the treatment of trauma, "scoop and scoop" is essential. Stabilizing the patient at the scene is a myth. A trauma score has been developed by which the patient's survival chances can be predicted. Perfection of this system will lead to more efficient use of helicopters.

Beyond the development of trauma systems, there is a need for high technology support as helicopters emerge in EMS systems; however, documentation of the need does not yet exist.



Dr. Howard Champion

Some of the EMS areas or needs that require more attention are:

- Cost effectiveness - less important to stress, i.e., don't overdo
- Develop more effective triage guidelines
- Incorporation of high technology diagnostic equipment in helicopters
- Incorporation of high technology life support technology in helicopters.

There is a need for a new generation of EMS helicopters, civilian and military, focusing on the modular design.

There is no National leadership for Disaster Preparedness and there needs to be.

ORIGINAL PAGE IS  
OF POOR QUALITY

## SYNOPSIS OF EMS INTEREST GROUP PRESENTATIONS/DISCUSSIONS


### The Operators

Presentations by the EMS helicopter operators provided the attendees with the various approaches used by their organizations in conducting helicopter evacuations. Current and projected rotorcraft R&T needs from the perspective of the operators were also presented. Key points were:

- Increasing sophistication of medical procedures have been accompanied by increases in costs. The health care economy of the 1980's makes this a stimulating challenge for health care administrators. This has been the genesis of the regionalization of health care. The rapid growth of hospital-based emergency air medical services (from two in 1972 to 36 in 1981) has clearly demonstrated the need for a national organization to support the development of high quality patient care. The growth of sophisticated inpatient care has presupposed equally sophisticated patient delivery systems. A well run patient delivery system leads to economies in patient care. It is expected that pressure to further develop advanced patient delivery mechanisms will continue through the next decade.

- The findings of the Public Services Helicopter User's Workshop EMS Working Group were reiterated. (See Appendix C).
- Accidents are the largest cause of death for those under 38. The cost to society each year is \$87 billion. 10.2 million people each year are hospitalized for one day or more, using 1 out of 8 hospital beds.


### Evolution of a Nationwide Network of Hospital-Based Emergency Helicopter Services



- There is a need for an advanced helicopter to provide the ability to deliver its crew at high speed (300 knots) directly to an urban roadway or rural area without being affected by roadway traffic, and not being limited by darkness, rain or snow.

ORIGINAL PAGE IS  
OF POOR QUALITY

### Geographic Distribution of Hospital-Based Emergency Helicopter Services



- Present day EMS needs require extensive modification of helicopters that were not designed for the multipurpose missions required by public service agencies. NASA is the logical agency to assume the design and development role, up through a prototype of the future needs of airborne public service agencies, including hospital-based emergency helicopter services. These needs, both long and short term, would then be presented to the manufacturers for further development and eventual production.
- There are five elements essential to a successful helicopter EMS operation.
  - The Helicopter
  - Ground Ambulances
  - Hospital Emergency Rooms
  - Centralized Communication System
  - The Emergency Medical Technician
- EMS helicopters are an important supplement to ground ambulances; however, they cannot possibly replace strategically located ground ambulances. The helicopter is reserved for critically injured victims whose risk of mortality or morbidity is greatly increased by ground transport. Only 2 to 5% of all accident victims are severe enough to warrant helicopter transport.
- With rotorcraft of advanced design and speed, accident response time can be reduced by as much as 80% and mortalities by 50% in both trauma and high risk neonates.
- One aircraft with modular capability can perform all Public Service functions.

- Over the past fifteen years, public service agencies across the nation have experimented and developed new uses of the helicopter to the point it has become an indispensable tool. New techniques created additional demands for services such as EMS.



### The Medical Aspects of EMS


Presentations by EMS physicians and hospital administrators provided the attendees with views of helicopter design and technology needs as they impact on civilian emergency medical applications, including costs and benefits. Key points in these presentations were:

- Helicopters are being used increasingly for civilian emergency medical applications, particularly for traumatized patients. While this role is common in the military, it is still in its infancy in the civilian sector. In general, the military employ the "swoop and scoop" philosophy with the helicopter serving merely as a transport vehicle. These are usually larger than their civilian counterparts because of their accessibility and are rarely "retrofitted" or suited for sophisticated medical treatment. While the military models are being employed successfully for the transport of patients with multiple-organ system trauma, most notably in the State of Maryland, most new systems are hospital based and are transporting patients with a broad spectrum of medical problems.

- Trauma team care must be available within first hour or "golden hour" of traumatic injury or critical illness to have any impact on reducing mortality.

— Within the "golden hour", patient must be reached, field treatment initiated, stabilized and transported to a trauma center.

— A response time of ten minutes or less after the initial call is the acceptable limit.





The Reduction in Time Before Surgery and Fatality Rates of War Wounded Due to Faster Transport to a Medical Facility

ORIGINAL PAGE IS  
OF POOR QUALITY




# STANDARD MORTALITY CURVE IS OF POOR QUALITY



- Cost has proved to be a major factor limiting the expansion of hospital-based programs and has dictated the use of light utility helicopters. Weight limitations and cabin configurations have placed severe restrictions on the level of treatment that can be provided. Physicians have been forced to compromise on crew composition and the quantity of medical equipment.
- The hospital emergency department environment cannot be reproduced in a helicopter. Thus, there are a number of important trade-offs in choosing a helicopter such as:
  - Affordability
  - Capability to perform all types of public service helicopter missions
  - Configured to permit excellent access to the head, neck, airway and thorax
  - Capable of carrying medical equipment and supplies needed for the critically ill patient
  - Low noise levels, vibration free and fast.
- It is imperative that the medical profession have input into the cabin design of any future EMS helicopter design. There are trade-off strategies that can be used to optimize medical care despite the limitations of presently available rotorcraft.
- With the emergence of the worldwide use of the rotorcraft for medical care over the last ten years, one striking development has failed to take place—the design and production of a helicopter by the rotorcraft industry specifically for EMS application.


- The full EMS system can be visualized as a pyramid.



ORIGINAL PAGE IS  
OF POOR QUALITY

- The preferred in-cabin configuration is depicted below:

- LEGEND
1. Patient Patch Plane
  2. Cathode Ray Tube Display
  3. On-Board Patient Computer
  4. Oxygen - Air Ventilator Controls
  5. Volume Ventilators
  6. Aortic Balloon Pump
  7. Survival Gurney Rack
  8. Storage



- There are some existing helicopters that are considered suitable for each level of EMS by retrofitting the cabin to accommodate the type of equipment necessary for monitoring of critically injured and ill patients and somewhat more access to the patient. The point remains, however, that the EMS user is still forcing the craft to do something its designers had not envisioned it to do.
- The preferred rotorcraft from the medical practitioners view is:

## EMS Helicopter

### DESIGN:

TWIN ENGINE  
LAND IN 60 FOOT DIAMETER  
FULL GURNEY ACCESS SLIDING DOOR  
NO TAIL ROTOR  
MEDICAL CABIN 10 FT. LONG, 5 FT. WIDE, 5 FT. HIGH  
CARGO HOLD 5 FT. LONG, 4 FT. WIDE, 4 FT. HIGH  
SINGLE PILOT IFR

### PERFORMANCE:

SPEED 250 KNOTS  
RANGE 400 STATUTE MILES  
ROTOR STARTUP OR SHUTDOWN 30 SECONDS  
SERVICE CEILING 20,000 FT. MSL  
PAYLOAD 3,000 POUNDS  
HOVER OUT OF GROUND EFFECT 10,000 FT. MSL

ORIGINAL PAGE IS  
OF POOR QUALITY

### The Manufacturers


Presentations by industry representatives highlighted the dilemma faced by the EMS community - the need for dedicated, high technology EMS helicopters versus the high cost of this technology. Key points in the discussion were:

- Present family of helicopters dedicated to the EMS role may be somewhat constrained by the limited internal dimensions.
- There are some large helicopters in operation now that are readily adaptable as a mobile medical surgical center, but they are too large for many EMS missions.
- The market for EMS configured helicopters required for a National EMS system is too small to justify the high R&D expenditures by industry.
- Great opportunities exist for current vehicles (single litter, light helicopter) but medical specialists desire an advanced vehicle, particularly with advances in medical technology and forecast trends in health care.
- Modifications to make existing helicopters more EMS-capable can be accomplished, but at great cost.

### The Government

The consensus reached by the Workshop participants was that the government role in EMS helicopter technology development should be performed by NASA. The key points made during the NASA/Industry Panel Discussion were:

- NASA is the proper agency to address special technology needs of the EMS helicopter.
- Continuing interchanges between NASA and technologists, operators and medical profession: are essential to the establishment of research and technology programs responsive to EMS-Helicopter system needs.



ORIGINAL PAGE IS  
OF POOR QUALITY

## ISSUES AND FINDINGS

17

Issue #1—Is speed necessary in transporting a patient from an accident scene to a medical facility?

### Findings

- The outcome of the trauma patient (mortality/morbidity and costs) is improved by reducing time between accident/incident and definitive medical care.
  - Trauma kills 115,000 persons a year and is third biggest killer in American Society
  - Monetary value of human life estimated by U.S. Department of Labor to be \$287,000
  - Accidents hospitalize 10,200,000 persons a year for one day or more, with patients occupying one out of eight beds in general hospitals.
  - Cost to society is estimated by the U.S. Department of Transportation to be 87 billion dollars per year
  - DOT forecasts an increase in deaths/injury severity due to large/small car mix on highways

ORIGINAL PAGE IS  
OF POOR QUALITY

## Issue #2—What is the helicopter role in EMS?

### Findings

- Response to severe accidents requiring time sensitive specialty care that cannot be provided by ground ambulances

#### Accident

- Traffic
- Recreational
- Industrial
- Residential

#### Specialty Care

- Shock Trauma Unit,
- Burn Center,
- Neonatal Center,
- Hand Center


- Situations too delicate or time critical to be performed by ground ambulances

#### Barriers to Ground Transportation

- Traffic congestion
- Snow clogged roads
- Flooding
- Terrain

#### Time Critical Movements

- Interhospital transfers of patients, medical supplies, organs and equipment



## Issue #3—What are the benefits of the EMS helicopter?

### Findings

- Accident response time reduced by 30-80%
- Mortalities in both trauma and high risk neonates reduced by 50%
- Patients transported to treatment centers consistent with their needs
- Relatively quick EMS provided to areas where none is currently available
- Timely evacuation of patients provided from remote or inaccessible areas
- Utilization of critical care facilities increased.



ORIGINAL PAGE 18  
OF POOR QUALITY

#### Issue #4—What are the technology needs for the EMS helicopter of the future?

##### Findings

- The medical community considers that current helicopter designs are inadequate for EMS
- Confirmed EMS helicopter needs identified in July 1980 Public Service Helicopter User's Workshop (Appendix C)
- Key technology needs
  - ride quality of fixed wing aircraft, i.e., reduced internal and external noise, reduced vibration
  - No tail rotor
  - Small rotor diameter
  - Improved visibility
  - Crashworthy vehicle
  - IFR capability
  - More affordable
  - High reliability
  - Fuel efficient
  - Specialized cabins for advanced medical/diagnostic and communications equipment
- Trade-off modular design (internal/external) versus dedicated vehicle

#### Issue #5—Can the helicopter become a cost-beneficial addition to the health care system?

##### Findings

- The cost-benefit of present helicopter ambulance programs, especially hospital-based systems, is generally based on the value of the patient occupying a bed and producing hospital revenue
- The cost-benefit justification for life-saving services remains for the most part intuitive and qualitative
- The financial viability of a helicopter EMS program should be evaluated on the basis of:
  - Qualitative value of the program on reducing the morbidity and mortality of the patients transported
  - Management of costs so as to minimize expense and maximize reimbursement
- Much more effort is needed to quantify and document the clinical value of the helicopter as a tool, including, but in addition to, its singular value of speed
- Tradeoffs can be made in requirements for higher speed helicopter versus on-site stabilization of the patient
- Reimbursement from insurance is based on ambulance due to medicare/medicaid stipulation; hence, emergency medical helicopter service must be subsidized from hospital revenues and ultimately borne by all health system users
- Since 90% of current helicopter transports are a single patient, this suggests an opportunity for a single litter, light helicopter. (Current Federal guidelines preclude this possibility.)
- Most cost/benefit studies to date have been microscopic, i.e., single hospital, and have not considered the macroscopic or national benefits

ORIGINAL PAGE IS  
OF POOR QUALITY

- Cost/benefit analyses are only a tool to help decide where dollars would be spent to benefit society when money is scarce
  - Ultimately, the public through pressure on law makers, will decide, unless funding is through private resources.

**Issue #6—What is the most cost beneficial method of developing, organizing, managing and utilizing an advanced helicopter EMS system?**

#### Findings

- A lead organization on the National level should be designated to establish concepts, locations and number of shock-trauma air medical services
- A national cost/medical benefits scientific data base is required for existing U.S. air medical services
- Holistic systems including fixed wing and rotorcraft utilizing advanced medical and aeronautical technology offer potential cost savings benefits.



ORIGINAL PAGE IS  
OF POOR QUALITY



## RECOMMENDATIONS

21

- The organizations listed below should be informed concerning the potential benefits of a National EMS program.


### FEDERAL/STATE

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)  
Office of Emergency Services (OES)  
Military Services  
Office of Civil Defense  
Department of Transportation/National Highway Traffic  
Safety Administration (DOT/NHTSA)  
Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS)  
National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA)

### PRIVATE SECTOR

- Insurance Industry  
American Medical Association (AMA)  
Medical Life Support and Diagnostic Equipment  
Manufacturers  
Helicopter Manufacturers
- Establish a national cost/medical benefits of EMS scientific data base for existing U.S. air medical services
    - Data collection should be a centralized and coordinated effort through organizations such as the American Society of Hospital-Based Emergency Air Medical Services (ASHBEAMS) or the American Trauma Society
  - Undertake a macro level cost benefit analysis of Helicopter EMS (consolidation of health care services/improved health care)
  - Institute a National public information program on the impact that trauma has on American society.
    - Third largest cause of death
    - Affects primarily young productive persons

- NASA should institute the following in coordination with EMS user hospitals, EMS medical equipment manufacturers and the medical industry:
  - A study on modular design trade-offs
  - A technology tradeoff analysis to analyze the interaction of desired advanced aircraft performance/capabilities with acquisitions/operation costs and technical feasibility.
  - A study to determine the tradeoff between expeditious patient transport versus on-site stabilization
- NASA should assume the lead in integrating Technology Requirements to define the potential market for Advanced Public Service Helicopters in the following areas:
  - EMS
  - Law enforcement
  - Disaster Relief
  - Civil Defense
  - Fire Fighting
  - Military
- NASA should continue integrative effort on advanced EMS helicopters via forums, workshops, studies and technology development.
- Identify one or more third party organizations required to finance a National Helicopter EMS effort and to assist in the development of appropriate capabilities at the local level
- Establish creative financing/financing options
- Establish within an existing Federal agency an organization to establish concepts, locations and number of shock-trauma air medical services.



ORIGINAL PAGE IS  
OF POOR QUALITY

Appendix A  
Emergency Medical Service  
(EMS)-Rotorcraft Technology  
Workshop  
October 14-16, 1981  
Final Agenda

# Emergency Medical Service (EMS)-Rotorcraft Technology Workshop

A3

## Final Agenda

Wednesday, October 14, 1981	12:30	LUNCH
7:30 REGISTRATION	2:00	MEDICAL EMS PERSPECTIVE-ESSENTIALS VS. NICETIES Dr. Richard Melker, Shands Teaching Hospital and Clinic
9:00 NASA WELCOME Dr. Walter B. Olstad, Deputy Assoc. Admin. OAST NASA HQ Introductions—Dr. John Zuk, NASA Ames	2:30	WEST GERMAN STATISTICS OF 10 YEARS OF OPERATION, HELICOPTER TASKS AND TECHNICAL HELICOPTER REQUIREMENTS Dr. Gerhard Kugler, ADAC
9:15 KEYNOTE REMARKS Today's Accomplishments and Tomorrow's Requirements for EMS Aircraft Dr. Christian Buhler, Swiss Air Rescue	3:15	COFFEE BREAK
10:00 ALEA AND NASA'S ROLE IN EMS Lt. Robert Morrison	3:45	COSTS/BENEFITS PANEL DISCUSSION Donald Richardson, SCT, Moderator • Michael Stringer, UCSD Hospital • Dr. Boyd Bigelow, St. Anthony's Hospital System, Denver, CO • Dennis Brimhall, Utah University Hospital • John Waters, Emergency Systems Consultant
10:15 ASHBEAMS Thomas Morgan, Director for Life Flight	5:00	A FUTURE PERSPECTIVE ON HELICOPTER EMS Dr. William Baxt, UCSD Hospital
10:45 COFFEE BREAK	5:30	NASA REMARKS AND ADMINISTRATIVE COMMENTS Betty Berkstresser, NASA Ames
11:15 NASA PUBLIC SERVICE HELICOPTER STUDY (EMS Highlights) Richard Adams, SCT	7:30	COCKTAIL BUFFET, FORT MCNAIR OFFICERS' CLUB Guest Speaker, Office of the Surgeon General U.S. Army
11:45 MIEMSS-ORGANIZATION, ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND FUTURE TECHNOLOGY NEEDS R Adams Cowley, M.D., Maryland Institute for EMS Systems		

Thursday, October 15, 1982

- 8:30 SIGNIFICANT MEDICAL REQUIREMENTS  
Dr. John Zuk, NASA Ames
- 8:45 DEDICATED HOSPITAL OPERATORS  
Jean Ross Howard, Aerospace Industries Association,  
Moderator
- Evergreen Helicopters, McMinnville, Oregon  
Kenneth McFadden
  - Hermann Hospital, Houston, Texas  
William Smith
  - Rocky Mountain Helicopters, Provo, Utah  
Floyd Helm
  - Air West Helicopters, Denver, Colorado  
William Keeney
  - St. Anthony's Hospital System, Denver, Colorado  
Daniel Reich
  - Baptist Hospital, Phoenix, Arizona  
William J. Walsh
- 10:45 COFFEE BREAK
- 11:00 PUBLIC SERVICE (CIVIL) OPERATORS  
Robert Richardson, Helicopter Association International,  
Moderator
- State Rescue  
Major Gary Moore, Maryland State Police
  - Rural Rescue  
Capt. Terry Jagerson, San Bernardino County  
Sheriff's Office
  - Urban Rescue  
Capt. Ken DeFoor, Houston Police Department
- 11:45 AIR AMBULANCE GUIDELINES  
Leo Schwartz, Chief EMS Branch, DOT-NHTSA
- 12:30 LUNCH
- 2:00 FEDERAL VIEWPOINTS ON EMS  
Dr. Phillip Bobo, Druid City Hospital, Regional Medical  
Center, West Alabama EMS
- 2:30 TECHNICAL AND MEDICAL REQUIREMENTS OF  
FUTURE HELICOPTERS  
Dr. Howard Champion, Washington Hospital Center  
Officer Butch Cronin, U.S. Park Police
- 3:00 TECHNOLOGY ALTERNATIVES FOR THE FUTURE  
EMS OPERATOR  
John Zugschwert, American Helicopter Society,  
Moderator
- R.E.R. Borland, Bell Helicopter, Textron
  - Larry Levine, Sikorsky Aircraft
  - Rod Taylor, Hughes Helicopter
  - Leonard LaVassar, Boeing-Vertol
- 4:00 NASA/INDUSTRY PANEL DISCUSSION  
Glen Gilbert, Glen Gilbert Associates, Moderator
- R.E.R. Borland, Bell Helicopter Textron
  - Larry Levine, Sikorsky Aircraft
  - Rod Taylor, Hughes Helicopter
  - Leonard LaVassar, Boeing-Vertol
  - John Ward, NASA Headquarters
  - William Snyder, NASA/Ames
  - Norman Fujisaki, FAA Helicopter R&D Program
- 4:45 CLOSING REMARKS  
Dr. John Zuk, NASA Ames
- 5:00 ADJOURNMENT

## Washington Hospital Center Tour and Static Helicopter Display

9:00-12:00 Friday, October 16, 1981

Workshop participants were privileged to have a tour of the Washington Hospital Center's Medical Shock-Trauma Acute Resuscitation (MedSTAR) unit conducted by its Director, Dr. Howard Champion, and the MedSTAR staff. The tour included a realistic demonstration of MedSTAR's handling of shock-trauma victims, as well as static displays of some helicopters used in EMS systems.

ORIGINAL PAGE IS  
OF POOR QUALITY



An architect's rendering of the new MedSTAR facility. The unit is housed on the first floor of the Center's intensive care wing, with immediate access to the only burn unit for adults in the region, as well as specialized units for coronary, surgical, medical and psychiatric intensive care. A full-service operating room is an integral part of the facility.

ORIGINAL PAGE IS  
OF POOR QUALITY



Appendix B  
Emergency Medical Services  
(EMS)-Rotorcraft Technology  
Workshop  
Participants



## PARTICIPANTS

Stephen A. Acai, Jr., NC Department of Human Resources	Dennis Brimhall, University of Utah Hospital	Alfredo Dabrowski, Inspector, Detroit Police Aviation	Jean Ross Howard, Aerospace Industries Association
Ronald E. Ace, Systems Control Technology	Paul R. Brockman, NASA Headquarters	William E. Davis, Helicopter Systems, Inc.	Cheryl Hutton, Methodist Hospital
Glen Adams, Federal Aviation Administration	Bob Brown, Heliflight Systems, Inc.	Ken T. Defoor, Houston Police Department	Caleb Hyatt, Broward County Sheriff's Department
Richard Adams, Systems Control Technology	Kenneth P. Brown, Kenn Air Christian Buhler, Swiss Air Rescue	Charles R. Eastwood, NASA Headquarters	Ray Ingham, Bell Helicopter Textron
James E. Akers, Baptist Medical Center	Eloise M. Calhoun, Medina Community Hospital	Chuck Eckert, Broward County Sheriff's Department	Richard J. Iseke, M.D., Boston City Hospital
Michael Altieri, M.D., Children's National Medical Center	Obie D. Calhoun, Fly-by- Helicopter - Lifeguard Rescue Division	William G. Fenlon, Western Ohio Emergency Medical Services	Iving Jacoby, M.D., University of Massachusetts Medical Center
Marguerite J. Badger, Hermann Hospital	Linda C. Carl, Loudoun MEM Hospital	Stephen J. Fincher, Westland Helicopters, Ltd.	Terry Jagerson, San Bernardino County Sheriff, Aviation Division
James, Bauchspies, ORI, Inc.	Edward S. Carter, Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation	Florence B. Fiori, DHHS Public Health Service	William James, Agusta Aircraft Corp.
William G. Baxt, M.D., University of California Medical Center, San Diego	Lou Casanova, EMS Coordinator- Pima County, Arizona	Rane Fonseca, Cascade Commercial Helicopter, Inc.	Doug Johnson
Judi Beaver, ORI, Inc.	Howard Champion, M.D., Washington Hospital Center	Norman Fujisaki, Federal Aviation Administration	Warren H. Kaye, Aero Interior Design, Inc.
Louie R. Bell, Cascade Commercial Helicopter, Inc.	Samuel W. Channel, Office of EMS Health Department	Glen A. Gilbert, Consultant, Helicopter Association International	William Keeney, Air West Helicopters, Inc.
Lowell E. Bender, Grindle & Bender	Robert C. Chinn, The PRADO EAST	Joseph H. Goodman, M.D., Ohio State University	Stephen M. Kelsey, Colorado EMS Division
Betty Berkstresser, NASA Ames Research Center	Richard T. Chittick, U.S. Park Police	Michael B. Gormley, P.G.C. HC John Hall, Davidson Army Airfield	Boyd Kesseling, Sikorsky Aircraft
Boyd Bigelow, M.D., St. Anthony Hospital System	Leonard E. Colp, Metropolitan Police Department, Washington National Airport	William E. Hall, D.C. Metropolitan Police Department	Donald J. Keune, Fly-by- Helicopter, Inc.
John Blake, Davidson Army Airfield	Ray E. Conrad, Bell Helicopter Textron	Thomas F. Hamlette, D.C. Metropolitan Police Department	Wayne B. Kielsmeier, Life Support International
Phillip Bobo, Tuscaloosa, AL	Larry T. Cooper, Lincoln Samaritan Air Evac	Phillip Hanna, Miami Valley Hospital	Ronald Krome, M.D., Detroit Receiving Hospital
Henry C. Bock, M.D., Methodist Hospital, Indianapolis	R Adams Cowley, M.D., Maryland Institute for Emergency Medical Services	Willard E. Hardwick, Methodist Hospital of Indianapolis	Gerhard Kugler, Emergency Rescue Department, ADAC, West Germany
Kathleen J. Boehm, Clinical Association, Ltd.	Earl (Butch) Cronin, U.S. Park Police	Floyd I. Helm, Rocky Mountain Helicopter, Inc.	Ludwell Lake, Phoenix Baptist Hospital and Health System
William E. Boehm, Eastern NM EMS Corporation	Albert J. Crook, FAA Air Transportation Division	Lynn W. Heninger, NASA Headquarters	Hyder Lakhani, ASI
Richard Bohlinger, Detroit Police Aviation	C. E. Crowell, Evergreen Helicopter	Sharon R. Heyka, Alexandria, VA	Harry Lamb, Airport Planning Administration
Robert Borland, Bell Helicopter Textron	Michael Curtis, St. Louis University Hospital	Edward M. Holmes, Leigh Memorial Hospital	Andrew Lathan, Borgess Medical Center
Joseph G. Brady, U.S. Park Police		John R. Hopkins, Life Flight Emanuel Hospital	Leonard J. LaVassar, Boeing- Vertrol
Sylvia J. Brennan, Spectrolab, Inc.			Glenn A. Leister, Federal Aviation Administration

Harold T. Lennon, Aviation Services Limited  
 Larry Levine, Sikorsky Aircraft  
 Richard E. Livingston, Federal Aviation Administration  
 Ken McFadden, Evergreen Life Line, Inc.  
 Susan D. McHenry, State EMS, Virginia Department of Health  
 Nancy Lee McKay, Mast West Central Florida  
 Preston V. McMurray, Phoenix Baptist Hospital  
 Geoff W. McNamara, Fairfax Fire and Rescue Training Division  
 Edward F. Martin, Delaware State Police  
 Kimball I. Maull, Medical College of Virginia  
 Forrest E. Meeks, Maryland State Police Aviation  
 Richard J. Melker, M.D., EMS, Shands Hospital, Inc.  
 Deborah Menne, ORI, Inc.  
 Gary E. Moore, Maryland State Police  
 Thomas Morgan, University of California Medical Center  
 Robert M. Morrison, Aero Bureau, Huntington Beach  
 Police Department  
 Stephen Moushegian, Evergreen Helicopters  
 Jerry Murray, Westover AFB, MA  
 Frank Mustico, Bell Helicopter Textron  
 Lawrence M. Mustico, Omniflight Group  
 Roger P. Neeland, Federal Aviation Administration  
 Stan Nelson, NASA Kennedy Space Flight Center  
 Richard Nensel, M.D., Toledo Hospital  
 James O. Donnell, Evergreen Helicopters, Inc.

Walter B. Olstad, PAST, NASA Headquarters  
 Morris Ostroff, EMS, University of Massachusetts  
 Michael Peikert, Borgess Medical Center  
 Charles Peterson, Sikorsky Aircraft  
 Lawrence J. Piotropaulo, MBB Helicopter Corporation  
 Greg Plechus, Aerospatale Helicopter  
 Paul C. Proctor, Pro Pilot Magazine  
 Joseph B. Pronesti, Allen County Police Aero.  
 John Ray, Augusta Aircraft Corp.  
 George Reenstra, Heliflight Systems, Inc.  
 John W. Reese, USDHHS HRA Bur. Health Fac.  
 Daniel R. Reich, St. Anthony Hospital System  
 Donald Richardson, Systems Control Technology  
 Robert Richardson, Helicopter Association International  
 Michael Robeano, Ohio Army National Guard  
 John W. Saddler, Cedar Rapids Aviation Department  
 Nick E. Samanich, NASA Lewis Research Center  
 William T. Sampson, U.S. Park Police Aviation  
 Terry Sanders, Volusia County Sheriff Department  
 Thomas Santamauro, Department of Health Services (OEMS)  
 Leo Schwartz, EMS Branch, DOT/NHTSA  
 Thomas D. Scott, II, Southern Regional EMS Council  
 Russell P. Seneca, M.D., General Surgeon  
 Ronald Shackelford, Arizona Department of Public Safety

James E. Smith, Geisinger Medical Center  
 James T. Smith, Kenn Air Corp  
 Kim Smith, Rotor & Wing International  
 William F. Smith, Hermann Hospital  
 William J. Snyder, NASA Ames Research Center  
 Robert Sommer, NASA Headquarters  
 George Spence, Dare County EMS  
 Joseph Sperrazza, Maryland Institute EMS  
 David Spottheim, Reisterstown, MD  
 John D. Stafford, Allentown-Sacred Heart Hospital  
 John E. Stawicki, Aero Interior Design, Inc.  
 Joseph A. Stein, Press  
 Curt Steinhart, Children's Hospital  
 Sam E. Stephenson, Jr., M.D., Baptist Medical Center  
 Bruce Stoehr, Chesapeake & Potomac Airways  
 Michael Stringer, University Hospital  
 Jim Sturm, Bell Helicopter Textron  
 Robert D. Taylor, California Highway Patrol  
 Rodney S. Taylor, Hughes Helicopters  
 James H. Thach, III, Sikorsky Aircraft  
 George F. Unger, NASA Headquarters  
 Mark Van Arnam, Volusia County Sheriff's Department  
 Jon P. Varian, Southwest Vert-Air  
 William J. Walsh, Baptist Hospitals and Health Systems  
 David Warburg, World Aid

John Ward, NASA Headquarters  
 Steve B. Wartenberg, Vertiflite  
 John M. Waters, Emergency Systems Consultant  
 W. E. R. Watt, Aero Interior Design, Inc.  
 Bill Williams, M.D., Arkansas St. University  
 Keith Williams, Augusta Aviation Corp.  
 Neil Williams, Aerospatale Helicopter  
 Barak Wolff, New Mexico Health and Environment Department  
 Paul Wowk, Toledo Hospital  
 John F. Zugschwert, American Helicopter Society  
 John Zuk, NASA Ames Research Center

ORIGINAL PAGE IS  
OF POOR QUALITY

Appendix C  
Excerpts  
From  
NAS CR 166469  
NAS CR 166470  
Helicopter Technology Needs  
Public Service Helicopter User's  
Workshop  
NASA Ames Research Center  
July 14-16, 1980

## Profiles of the Mission

C3

### Emergency Medical Services

Accidents are the largest cause of death for those under 38. The cost to society each year is \$62 billion. 10.2 million people each year are hospitalized for one day or more, which is one out of every eight hospital beds.

The Workshop identified the following challenges:

- To sustain the life functions of the trauma victim.
- To transport the trauma victim to a regional trauma facility where the victim will receive definitive care from a highly skilled trauma staff with the aid of a specially designed and equipped facility.
- To reduce significantly the time of transport; for time is the enemy of the trauma victim.
- To transport the victim in all types of weather conditions at any hour.
- To transport the victim in a manner independent of conventional roadways which are often congested.
- To transport the trauma victim from an urban or rural environment.

How are these challenges met? The helicopter, which has become an important part of the Emergency Medical System, meets all of these challenges.

The helicopter with a skilled crew can maintain the trauma victim's life functions with advanced life support equipment. This combination has proved invaluable in the first few minutes of care.

A need for an advanced rotorcraft was identified by the EMS working group to provide the ability to deliver its crew at high speed (300 knots) directly to an urban roadway or rural area without being affected by roadway traffic, and not being limited to darkness, rain, or snow.

With rotorcraft of advanced design and speed, accident response time can be reduced by as much as 80% and mortalities by 50% in both trauma and high risk neonates.

## Public Service Technology Needs

### VEHICLE DESIGN

1. Increased Speed (300 Kt dash, 30 min max, 200 KT max continuous)
2. HIGE 20000 feet (single engine)
3. HOG 10000 feet (single engine)
4. Twin engine
5. Endurance - 4 hours
6. 10000 lb max G.W.
7. 20' rotor diameter
8. Eliminate tail rotor
9. Internal cabin area (60" high x 52" wide x 96" long)
10. Modularized cabin
11. Pressurization\*
12. Autorotation capability
13. Internal & external noise reduction
14. Pilot operated hoist
15. Compatible electrical system
16. Shutdown power capability
17. Quick access maintenance
18. Water/retardant capability
19. Improved all terrain landing gear
20. Improved visibility
21. Improved maneuverability
22. Sliding cargo door
23. Internal access to cargo cabin
24. Equipment storage
25. Cold interior lighting
26. Hot refueling capability

\*Optional

# Public Service Technology Needs

C5

## PROPULSION

1. Non-petroleum fuels
2. Multiple fuel capability
3. Low fuel consumption
4. Dual power band
5. Increased shaft HP
6. Lightweight power plant
7. Emergency power capability
8. Particle separators (FOD proofs)
9. Main rotor clutch
10. Minimal Warm-up time

## SAFETY & RELIABILITY

1. Crashworthy structure
2. Crashworthy seats
3. Crashworthy fuel system
4. Eliminate dynamic roll-over
5. Improved restraint system
6. Improved helmets
7. Improved egress system
8. Increased main rotor clearance
9. Reduced tail rotor hazard (remove tail rotor)
10. Birdstrike protection
11. Removable ballistics protection & detection
12. Fuel dumping capability
13. Fire protection
14. Hazardous material storage

## NAVIGATION GUIDANCE & FLIGHT CONTROLS

1. Automatic flight control
2. Combined controls
3. Stabilization
4. All weather capability
5. Low airspeed measurement
6. Electronic map display
7. Precision location/navigation

## AUXILIARY SYSTEMS

1. Hoist locations & capabilities
2. Rappel attachments
3. Improved litter
4. Litter suspension
5. Night vision system
6. Improved searchlight
7. Optical equipment
8. Photo/TV equipment
9. On-board APU
10. A/C visual identification
11. Car identifier
12. Car lock-on
13. Car stopper
14. Towing equipment

## HUMAN FACTORS

1. Improved seats
2. Environmental control
3. Noise and vibration
4. Control standardization
5. Dual controls
6. Visibility
7. Integrated flight instruments

## MONITORING & DIAGNOSTIC SYSTEMS

1. Trend warning
2. Computerized monitoring system
3. Warning/caution system
4. Color coded annunciation
5. Aural warning
6. Head-up display
7. Performance limitations

ORIGINAL PAGE IS  
OF POOR QUALITY